# A
# *Friendly-Debate*
Between
# *SATAN* and *SHERLOCK:*
Containing
A Diſcovery of the unſoundneſs of Mr. *William Sherlocks* Principles, In a late Book Entituled *A Diſcourſe concerning the Knowledg of Jeſus Chriſt*, &c. Charles Nice Davies 1822

By this only Medium, That they afford the Devil the ſame grounds for his hope of Salvation, that they do Mankind; and ſo ſubvert the Goſpel, and transform Chriſtianity into Mahumetaniſm. by Tho: Dawson

---

By an hearty Enemy of *Mahumetaniſm.*

---

*In* Sociniſmo, *qui* ſubtilior Mahumetiſmus *non immerito vocatur, pandit os ſuum ipſa vorago, ipſum Barathrum irreligionis.* Arrowſmith. *Tact. Sacr. l. 2. c. 1. Sect. 14.*

*Eos* [*ſc. Socinianes*] *non modo Chriſtianorum, ſed nec hæreticorum nomine dignor. Chriſtianitatem nomine retinent, re deſtruunt, Itaque hos a Mahumetiſtis nos longe ſeparo, qui ne ipſi quidam Jeſu maledicunt.* Grotius *in Epiſt. ad Wallæum. Wall. opera in fol. p. 399.*

---

Printed in the Year. 1676.

# TO THE READER.

A *Sufficient (though a ſhort) account of the deſign of theſe Sheets hath been already given in the Title Page; yet the Author conceives himſelf obliged to make an Apology for three things, which he preſumes an intelligent Reader may fault in them.*

1. *That they come out ſo late, when many Perſons of ability have foiled the Adverſary; and when he hath mollified the harſhneſs of many expreſſions here repeated, in a ſecond Diſcourſe. To the former he anſwers, That none hath dealt with Mr.* Sherlock *upon the medium here ſuggeſted; and that the World had*

*had theſe Sheets ſooner, if this medium they contain, had come ſooner in his thoughts. To the latter, that he finds not in Mr.* Sherlocks *ſecond Diſcourſe, any retractation of his unſound Tenets, though he ſeems upon ſecond thoughts not ſo well pleaſed with his own Phraſeology, as giving cauſe to every* Man *whoſe addition is* Chriſtian, *to* ſuſpect, that under a pretence of rectifying miſtakes, he deſigned to expoſe all Religion (*which not without cauſe he intimated his fear of,* Pref. p. 3. of his firſt Diſcourſe).

2. *It may be blamed that Mr* Sherlocks *Principles are repreſented under this form of a* Dialogue; *and with ſo odious a choice of a* Dialogiſt: *For the form it ſelf, the Author might ſuppoſe the examples which ſome of Mr* Sh's *perſuaſion have ſet him, a ſufficient juſtification. Mr* Hoard *in a book Entituled,* Gods Love to Mankind, *hath framed a Conference between* Tempted *and* Miniſter,

ſter, *to ſhew how uncapable the* Tempted *are of true comfort, or* Miniſters *to give it, upon the Church of* England's *Principles, in the* Quinquarticular *Controverſie. And this perhaps occaſioned a moſt learned Father of the Church of* England's *accurate Diſcourſe againſt the whole Book. And ſince, an Anonimous Author publiſhed in Latin a Dialogue, called* Fur prædeſtinatus, *Elect Thief. between a* Calviniſt *Miniſter, and a Thief condemned to be hanged, with a deſign to expoſe the Doctrine of the Proteſtant Churches in the Five Points; which gave an Alarm to a learned Son of the Church of* England, *and made him take Arms in its defence and vindication. And ſince them, one bearing the name of* the Iriſh-Saint, *hath publiſhed Two parts of a* Friendly-Debate. *And ſince him (to trouble the Reader with no more Examples) another hath Printed,* A Diſcourſe between Two intimate Friends. *Both which laſt, drive on the ſame deſign with the two firſt, but more covertly,*

*ly, upon pretence of lashing the Non-Conformists only (whom yet the Church of* England *hath more than once acknowledged for Conformists in Doctrine). The Author of this Dialogue will not deny, (what he supposes any intelligent Reader may except against the use of them) that Dialogues give an advantage to their Compiler to put what words he pleases into his Adversaries mouth, to the prejudice of his own Cause. And whether the Compilers of the Dialogues above-mentioned, have not therefore made choice of this, rather than another form of Discourse? And whether they have not sufficiently improved it to that end, he had rather others, than himself should say? As for himself, he can alledg, that the medium he hath pitcht upon, hath almost necessitated him to appear in this Garb: And whether he hath made a virtue (or a vice) of necessity, he is very well contented the Reader should be judg (as indeed he will be, be the Author pleased or displeased):*

*pleaſed*): *And that he may judg aright he is deſired to obſerve, that what is Printed in a different Character with the number of a Page, is Mr.* Sherlocks *own words: The reſt (except now and then a little merriment, or chiding) contains Conſequences, and Explications of his Principles, ſo eaſie and uninforced in the Authors own judgment, that he does hereby boldly offer himſelf to be tried by his Countrey. If fair words would win belief, he might borrow Mr.* Sherlocks (*which are freſh in memory*) I have repreſented his Opinions in his own words, and am not conſcious to my ſelf, that I have put any other ſenſe upon his words than he intended; and I cannot ſee what reaſon any Man hath to take it ill, that I repeat that which he himſelf thought fit to publiſh, *Pref. p.* 3. *But ſo many have ſaid of him,* Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam, *What do you tell me of words, when I ſee contrary deeds. That the* Author *is afraid leſt his own ſincerity ſhould be ſuſpected,* eo nomine, *becauſe he affects*

*to*

*to profeſs it in Mr.* Sherlocks *words: However he hath run the venture for once, being aſſured that the words are innocent enough, how guilty ſoever of abuſing them Mr* Sherlock *may have been. The only thing that the Author of this Dialogue conceives a leſs obſervant Reader may have juſt cauſe to diſlike, is, that Mr.* Sh. *is brought in as* ex profeſſo, *deſigning to give the Devil hopes of Salvation; which yet he no where does throughout his whole Biok. But for that, the Author is willing to be quit or caſt, as Mr.* Sherlocks *own* Practice *and* Apology *for it, ſhall give their verdict. His* Practice *is this, That he brings in the Learned men againſt whom he Writes, as* renouncing Chriſt's mediation, and truſting to the goodneſs of his Nature; as ſetting up a new Religion, which hath no Covenant, and no Promiſe, *p.* 23. and as quitting Chriſts Promiſe and his Covenant, to rely and rowl upon his Perſon, *p.* 24. The Apology *is this,* This is ſo very abſurd at firſt

ſight

ſight, that I know no Man will own in it ſo many words, nor do I charge any Man with it; but I ſay, this is the natural Interpretation of truſting in the Perſon of Chriſt, in his Blood, and Merits, and All-ſufficiency, and of relying and rowling the Soul on Chriſt for Salvation, and the like Phraſes of a late date, in which ſome men place the whole Myſtery of the Goſpel, *p.* 24. mutatis mutandis; *the Author accepts it for his Apology, that to give the Devil as fair hopes of Salvation as Mankind, is ſo very abſurd, that he knows Mr.* Sherlock *will not own it in ſo many words, nor does the Author charge him with it; but he ſays, This is the natural Interpretation of Gods loving all his creatures, according to the capacity of their Natures, and of Gods fetching the Reaſon of his Love to them, from their holineſs (and that imperfect too); and of making the creatures ground of hope of pardon and acceptance, to be not an offer'd Saviour, or a Promiſe, but Gods*

gracious

*gracious Nature, which obliges him to receive a penitent ſinner, and to reward all his good actions, which are ſincerely (though not perfectly) good; and the like Doctrines of a late date, which Mr.* Sherlock *puts in the place of the whole myſtery of the Goſpel, till Chriſts Incarnation (as the Dialogue will more particularly inform the Reader). And what is this (by the by) to retort Mr.* Sherlocks *unjuſt charge upon his Antagoniſts, moſt juſtly upon himſelf, but* to renounce Chriſts Mediation, *and* truſt to the goodneſs of his Nature [as God] *and* to ſet up a new Religion, which hath no Covenant, and no Promiſe?

*As for the choice (odious enough) of a Dialogiſt to hold Mr.* Sherlock *in Diſcourſe: The Author could not avoid it, in regard of the* Medium *he inſiſts upon. For who can be imagined a fitter Perſon to debate the Point with him, whether there be any ground of hope for the Devils*

*vils Salvation, than the perſon concerned,* Satan *himſelf?*

3. *The laſt thing that ſome Readers may fault is, That this Dialogue detracts from the Devils abilities of managing a Controverſy: For he is commonly introduced as acquieſcing in Mr.* Sherlocks *grounds, which are liable enough to exception. To that the Author replies, that there is a* Fitneſs *and a* Neceſſity *of repreſenting the Devil as a mean Diſputant.* A Fitneſs, *There being nothing ſo diſhonourable to himſelf, which the Devil will not ſubmit to, to attain his miſchievous end, the involving mankind, into the ſame irreparable miſery with himſelf (as dayly experience aſſures us): Satan may be preſumed to be well enough contented to ſeem overcome by Mr.* Sherlocks *argumentation, That ſinful men may be induced to lean upon an houſe which will not ſtand, to take up ſtrong hopes upon weak grounds, which will certainly fail them*

*them when they most need them.* A Necessity, *in regard of the deficiency of Mr.* Sherlocks *Book (to which the Dialogue is confined) which affords not answers to multitudes of exceptions (which might have been put into Satans mouth) against the Principles therein contained.*

*And perhaps some Readers may find a fourth fault, that the Author brings in Satan as playing upon Mr* Sherlock. *But hath not Mr* Sherlock *taken the same liberty with his Antagonists? Yes, and made an Apology for it. The Author is content to do so too, and to undergo the censure of a Fool,* Qui maluit culpam excusare, quum non committere, *i. e. who had rather commit a fault, and get a pardon by an Apology; than to be innocent, and so stand in need of neither: And one Apology will serve us both(only changing the persons).* Where he pretends to argue gravely. I have examined his Arguments with all possible gra-

gravity and ſolemnity; where he plainly toys and trifles, I have ſo far complied with his humour, as to ſmile ſometimes, though as modeſtly, as any Man can deſire. *Pref. p. 3. But the Reader hath been too long detained in the Porch, he may now with the Authors good leave go into the Houſe it ſelf, if he thinks there is any thing within that is worth the ſeeing.*

# *A Friendly-Debate*

## BETWEEN

## *SATAN* and *SHERLOCK.*

*Sherlock*, Well met *Satan*, I am ſorry to ſee you look ſo ſad; pray, What's the matter?

*Satan*, Sure, Sir, you cannot be ignorant of the cauſe of my ſadneſs. Alas! I am a miſerable creature, and ſee no hope of mending my condition.

*Sherlock*, I had thought you had underſtood your ſelf better, then to be ſo cauſeleſly dejected. *The light of nature, and works of Creation and Providence aſſure us, that God is ſo good, that he deſigns and deſires the happineſs of all his creatures according to the capacity of their Natures*, p. 42. Either therefore thou art none of his Creatures, or thy Nature uncapable of happineſs, or God deſigns and deſires thy happineſs, as well as of other of his Creatures.

*Satan*, What aſſurance the light of Nature

and works of Creation and Providence gives you, I know not: But to me it gives none of Gods pardoning Mercy to ſinners. I have heard *That the Love of God to ſinners, and his pardoning Mercy, could never have entred into the heart of Man or Angels, but by Chriſt.* And the Scripture ( which I believe againſt my will ) ſeems to countenance the aſſertion; for this love is called *a myſtery hid in God, and made known to Gentiles*, and *to Principalities and powers*: That is, to Angels.

*Sherlock*, What! I perceive you have been an hearer at ſome Conventicle; one *J. O.* tells us ſo indeed; but I ſay, *He is a confident Man to tell us ſo, when the experience of the whole World confutes him: For whatever becomes of his new Theories, both Jews and Heathens ( who underſtood nothing at all of what Chriſt was to do in order to our recovery ) did believe God to be gracious and merciful to ſinners.*—— *And theſe natural Notions the Heathens had of God, and all theſe diſcoveries God had made of himſelf in the works of Creation and Providence, did aſſure them, that God is very good, and it is not poſſible to underſtand what goodneſs is without pardoning Grace*, p. 44. You remember that paſſage I ſuppoſe, for I doubt not but you read our Books, as well as hear the Fanaticks Preachments.

*Satan*, I am willing to reſign up my ſelf to your conduct, ſeeing your deſign is ſo favourable

vourable to my intereſt; or otherwiſe I might ſtart a ſmall objection, againſt the laſt clauſe of your Diſcourſe, That it ſeems then, that *if Angels and Men had never ſinn'd, it had not been poſſible for either of them to underſtand what the goodneſs of God is.* But to let that paſs, I have read in your Bibles, that God *will be gracious to whom he will be gracious, and will ſhew mercy on whom he will ſhew mercy.* It ſeems to me then by theſe paſſages, that notwithſtanding the graciouſneſs of Gods Nature, he uſes a Soveraignty in the exerciſe of Grace; and is not induced thereto by any reaſon out of himſelf.

*Sherlock*, I confeſs the *Calviniſts* make ſtrange work with ſuch paſſages: But I am of opinion, that *it is a ſtrange notion of an Independent being, that he muſt have no other reaſon for what he does, but his own arbitrary will; which is ſo far from being a perfection, that it deſtroys all other perfections of his Nature*, p. 402. *The excellency of Chriſts Love conſiſts in this, that he loves for no Reaſon, in their ſenſe, who make him love the Perſon of a Believer, without conſidering any other Qualification, than that he is ſuch an Individual Perſon. Now I confeſs this is a wonderful Love: But wherein the excellency of it conſiſts, I cannot ſee. I am ſure we account that Man a fool, who loves at this rate; and how that ſhould come to be the perfection of the Love of God, which is a re*

*proach to Men, is above my apprehenſion*, p. 399.

*Satan*, But I pray Sir, tell me then what other Reaſon but his own arbitrary Will, God could have for ſhewing mercy to ſinners?

*Sherlock*, *The holineſs of a Creature, is the Reaſon why God determines his Love to any particular perſon*, p. 401.

*Satan*, If I be not much miſtaken, I have heard ſome ſuch paſſages read in ſome or other of your Churches Second Leſſons, That *God hath choſen men before the foundation of the World, that they ſhould be holy*; *and that Chriſt loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it, that it ſhould be holy, and without blemiſh*; which ſeems to make the holineſs of a Creature the effect, not the cauſe of Gods Love. But I have told you, I am reſolved at this time to be a Learner, and *oportet diſcentem credere*, The Scholar muſt believe his Maſter, is a Rule among Teachers—It may be *Paul* was miſtaken, for I have heard ſome ſay, that he was *an hot-headed Fellow*; and now here's no body but our ſelves, you will excuſe my freedom in telling you, that as far as I have been able to obſerve, none of your *Club* care much for him. For their greateſt trouble in dealing with the Fanaticks, is to rid their hands well of the Allegations out of him. But to our buſineſs, ſuppoſing your Doctrine true, I am an unholy Creature, I cannot deny it, and therefore God

hath

hath no Reaſon for the determination of his love to me.

*Sherlock*, If you be unholy, then you muſt make your ſelf holy.

*Satan*, I, but I doubt that's paſt my skill: There is a ſpiritual impotency and inability in a ſinner to do any good thing.

*Sherlock*, Who told you ſo, Sir Satan? *John Calvin*, I dare ſay, *or John Owen*: but I hope you have more wit than to believe them.

*Satan*, No indeed, I was told ſo by St. *Auſtin*, and many a great man of your Church, Fathers and Sons. But before them all, by your *Arch-Adverſary* St. *Paul*, who ſays that *ſinners are dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*; and *that they are created to good-works*, and become *new creatures*, and *born again*, when converted.

Sherlock, *When they talk of our ſpiritual impotency and inability to do any good thing, they prove it wonderfully from our being dead in treſpaſſes and ſins, and therefore as a dead man can contribute nothing to his own reſurrection, no more can we towards our converſion: which is true of natural death, but will be hard to prove of a moral death, which conſiſts in the prevalency of vicious habits contracted by long cuſtom (which was the caſe of the Heathens, whom the Apoſtle there ſpeaks of,* (and is your caſe too, Sir Satan) *which do ſo enſlave the will) that it is very difficult, though not impoſſible for ſuch perſons to return to the love and practice of vertue. The other Argu-*

*ment is of the like nature, that we are ſaid to be created to good works, and to become new creatures, and therefore can contribute no more to it* (viz. *our Converſion*) *than we did to our firſt creation: and that we are born again, which ſignifies that we are wholly paſſive in it: which were true indeed, if our being created to good works did ſignifie the manner and method of our converſion, and not the nature of the new creature, which is the true meaning of it, that as in the firſt Creation we were created after the Image of God, ſo we are renewed after his Image in the ſecond; which is therefore expreſly call'd in other places the renewing and renovation of our minds*, p. 109, 110, *The fruitfulneſs of Gods love with reſpect to the methods of his Grace and Providence, doth not conſiſt in producing what he loves, by an omnipotent and irreſiſtible power (for then ſin and death could never have entred into the world) but he governs and doth good to his creatures in ſuch ways as are moſt ſuitable to their natures. He governs reaſonable Creatures by principles of Reaſon, as he doth the Material world by the neceſſary laws of matter, and bruit creatures by the inſtincts and propenſities of nature*, p. 212. *This I am ſure is a new diſcovery,* (whatever you ſay of St. *Auſtin*, and the great men of our Church) *that it is impoſſible for us to do any thing that is good, but we muſt be acted like Machines, by an external force, by the irreſiſtibl power of the Grace and Spirit of God*, p. 50. Satan

*Satan.* I have heard your long Diſcourſe with a great deal of patience; and your meaning as well as I can take it up, is, that converſion is an effect of *moral ſuaſion*, (a term of art which many of your good friends much delight to uſe, and I liſtned to hear it out of your mouth) ſo that if I do but attend to what God hath revealed of the excellency and neceſſity of Holineſs, θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς *ut puto Deus fio*, I ſhall be holy all on a ſudden. But I am not very apt to believe this, becauſe my mind hath been a great while illuminated with ſuch Revelations, and yet I do not find my Will moved by them. As for what you object againſt ſinners being wholly paſſive in the work of Converſion, if you had to do with a Phanatick he would preſs you with this Argument; *If the Image of God was received by the will in the firſt creation, without its own contribution to the production of it, why may not that Image be reſtored to it without the wills cooperation to the reſtitution?* But becauſe I perceive you have a kindneſs for me, I will not perſonate any of that fooliſh troubleſome ſort of people, who can ask more Queſtions than a wiſe man can anſwer.

Well Sir, let us go on; but ſuppoſe I ſhould make my ſelf holy, yet if I be not perfectly ſuch, I am never the near to obtain my end, Gods favour and acceptance. For I well remember there is a paſſage in the Bible, *That God is of purer eyes than to behold evil,*

*and cannot look on iniquity*, that is with approbation, (as I have heard Preachers expound it,) and you your ſelf tell me that *Gods natural love to holineſs, is the reaſon why he loves holy men*, p. 401. And by the like reaſon ſure holy Angels; whence I infer (for I have pickt up a little Logick as well as Divinity in the Schools) that perfect holineſs in the creature muſt be the reaſon of Gods natural love to it, for that only is agreeable to his holy nature.

*Sherlock*, Nay, there you are out in your inference; for *the only way to obtain the pardon of our ſins, is to repent of them, and forſake them*, p. 54. *God is as ready to pardon the worſt of men*, (and why not the worſt of Angels) *when they return to their duty, as a kind father is to receive an humble and penitent prodigal*, p. 43. So that though God loves perfect holineſs beſt, yet he loves imperfect ſo well, as to pardon the defects, and accept it.

*Satan*, But God hath made me no promiſe of forgiveneſs, if I ſhould repent and forſake my ſins, and therefore I have no ground for faith or hope. And if I might credit St. *Paul* (which I ſhould be apt to do, but for fear of diſpleaſing you my good friend, who have put me in better hope of happineſs than ever I had ſince I loſt my place in heaven) ſinners that are without promiſe, are without hope, and conſequently without faith (for hope is an effect of faith). So that methinks your

plaiſter

plaister is not as broad as my sore.

*Sherlock.* I perceive that either you have not read my Book, or you have not well minded some passages in it, which answer your Objection. Therein I affirm, that *there is a natural faith* [ and so proportionably a natural hope ] *i. e. a belief of the principles of the natural Religion, which is founded upon natural demonstration, or moral Arguments, as that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him, which was the faith of* Abel *and* Enoch, *whereby they pleased God: For there being no mention made of the faith of* Abel *and* Enoch *in the Old Testament, the Apostle proves that they were true Believers, because they had this Testimony, That they pleased God: now it is impossible to be sincerely religious, or to do any acceptable service to God, without the belief of his Being and Providence, and care of good men. These are the first Principles of all Religion, and God requir'd no more of those good men, who had no other particular Revelations of his will,* pag. 252, 253. And again———

*Satan.* Hold a little, I pray good Mr. *Sherlock.* I have greater things to mind, yet I cannot but gratifie my curiosity in pausing a little upon your new *Genus* of Faith, that it is a *belief.* The Schools are wont to make it *an assent.* But like enough they are mistaken (as in an hundred things more.) And your *ratio formalis* of Faith is wholly new,

that

that it is natural demonſtration, and moral arguments; ſo that (as I underſtand you) one and the ſame habit is Science, Opinion and Faith. I perceive your Philoſophy as well as Divinity is quite different from theirs. But I forget my ſelf, let thoſe new notions be true or falſe, I will take them upon truſt from you for once. I will recollect the ſum of your diſcourſe, That if I have no promiſe of Gods rewarding my repentance, and forſaking of my ſin, no more had *Abel* and *Enoch*, and yet for all that they pleaſed God. And that the Principles of Natural Religion being common to me and mankind as rational Creatures, a promiſe of rewarding my good actions, though they be not ſo good as they ſhould be, if they be as good as I can afford them) is included in the very notion of Gods goodneſs. Is not this it?

*Sherlock.* Right; now you have hit the nail on the head. And to confirm you in your apprehenſion, I will go on where we left. *The light of Nature, and the works of Creation and Providence aſſure us, that God is ſo holy, that he hath a natural love for all good men, and will not fail to reward them*, p. 42. *And had Chriſt never appeared in the world, yet we had reaſon to believe that God is thus good, and holy and merciful.*—— *The appearance of Chriſt did not firſt diſcover the nature of God to us, but—— confirms us in the belief of what we had learnt before from Nature*, p. 34. Sa-

*Satan.* Sir, Your Diſcourſe is very ſolid, and hath but one ſmall fault, a *Contradiction* to what you ſay elſewhere. *Theſe men who talk of the Perſon and perſonal excellencies of Chriſt frequently without any ſence, and generally without any juſt ground from Scripture or reaſon, are very clamorous, and alarm the world with ſtrange jealouſies and fears, as if there were a party of men ſtarted up, who deſign to make Chriſt uſeleſs, and to reduce Religion to its firſt natural ſtate, which knew no Prieſt, nor Sacrifice, nor Mediator. A deſign which I profeſs I am wholly a ſtranger to, as I belive all thoſe are who are ſo much charged with it; the foundation of my hope is that which is the foundation of the Chriſtian Religion, the Sacrifice and Interceſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, p. 13, 14. Pray let me ask you without offence (and I will ſpeak ſoftly that *J. O.* and that Fraternity may not overhear) Is not this to make Chriſt uſeleſs, and to reduce Religion to its firſt natural ſtate, when you make no other duty neceſſary to happineſs, than what the light of Nature ſuggeſts; and no other ground needful to the hopes of it, than the goodneſs of God, which had been known as fully (as now it is) if Chriſt had never appeared in the world? This is the ſum of your Diſcourſe. I am very careful not to do you wrong in miſrepreſenting your ſenſe.

*Sherlock.* Satan, you are grown ſo old, that I think

I think you begin to dote. If you had read on, you might have underſtood my mind to the full. *But I doubt not, it will appear in the ſequel, what the ground of theſe calumnies are,* viz. *That we are charged with making Chriſt uſeleſs, only becauſe we dare not make his Laws and Religion ſo,* p. 15.

*Satan.* Methinks you are very ſhort with me. I have been always accounted a knave, but never was counted a fool before now. But as much a fool as I am, I am ſure I did you a kindneſs in reading no further, for that addition makes you more liable to that cenſure you would avoid: For 'tis plain enough you make Chriſts Laws and Religion uſeleſs, if Natures Laws and Religion will conduct a man ſafe to the ſame place, *viz.* Heaven, which Chriſt directs him to, (for *Fruſtrà fit per plura quod fieri poteſt per pauciora*, is a rule I learned among the freſh men, that chop Logick in the Univerſities) and conſequently Chriſt is made uſeleſs, becauſe you dare make his Laws and Religion ſo. And elſewhere you ſay, *We have no reaſon to expect any thing from the perſon of Chriſt, which is not contained in his Covenant, much leſs which contradicts it, for that would be in effect to renounce his mediation, and to truſt to the goodneſs of his nature. And let any man judg, whether this be not to ſet up a new Religion, which hath no Covenant and no Promiſe,* p. 23.

*Sherlock.* I think I have little to do to ſtand and hear you prate. Farewell. *Sa-*

*Satan.* Good Mr. *Sherlock* be not so hot. Pray let me find that what you want in *Grace*, you have in *Vertue*. Do not run away in a Pet, before you have finished your design. You must not suppose I oppose you *ex animo*, but *argumentandi gratiâ*; and to give you an opportunity of shewing your dexterity in loosning the knots I tye.

*Sherlock.* You might have told me so at first then, and then you might have escaped an hard censure. I will go on. Your great Objection was, That the Gentiles who were without promise, were *eo nomine* in that very respect without hope. To that I answer, *When God chose the posterity of* Abraham *to be his peculiar people, he did not design to exclude the rest of the world from his care and providence and all possible means of salvation, as the Apostle argues in* Rom. 3. 29, Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? yes of the Gentiles also? *Which argument if it have any force in it, must prove Gods respect to the Gentiles before the preaching of the Gospel, as well as since, because it is founded on that natural relation God owns to all mankind, as their merciful Creator and Governour, which gives the Gentiles as well as the Jews an interest in his care and providence. This plainly evinces, that all these particular favours which God bestowed on* Israel *were not owing to any partial fondness and respect to that people, but the design of all was to*

*en-*

*encourage the whole world to worſhip the God of Iſrael, who gave ſo many demonſtrations of his Power and Providence*, p. 27.

*Satan.* If I underſtand you aright, your meaning is, that the Gentiles before the preaching of the Goſpel, as well as ſince, had all poſſible means of Salvation, and as much ground for hope of it as the *Jews*, becauſe God was their common merciful Creator and Governour. And therefore loved them all alike. And hence you would direct me to conclude (as well I may, if the premiſes be true) that God being the common merciful Creator and Governour of Angels and Men, therefore I have all poſſible means of Salvation, and ſufficient ground to hope for it as well as men. If this be not the force of your Argument, I will forgive your hard cenſure, and think I begin to dote indeed. But methinks the premiſes are liable to exception. I might ask you, Sir, where were any *Jews* and Gentiles before the preaching of the Goſpel? for I always apprehended that the Goſpel was preached to *Adam* and *Eve* before they did *operam dare ad liberos procreandos*, before they had any conjugall Society (you ſee as old as I am, I have not forgotten all my *Latin*) in thoſe words, *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy ſeed and her ſeed; it ſhall bruiſe thy head, and thou ſhalt bruiſe his heel.*

*Sherlock.* I have obviated this Objection in

my

my reply to a like inſtance of the promiſe made to *Abraham*; *In thy ſeed ſhall all the nations of the earth be bleſſed.* To which my anſwer is, *Chriſt was indeed the material object of* Abrahams *Faith, that is, he believed that promiſe which God made of ſending Chriſt into the World. But* Abrahams *Faith was not a Faith in Chriſt; no Man could believe in Chriſt, till he came, that is, could not believe any thing upon his Authority, which is the true notion of believing in him.* p. 247.

*Satan*, The application I find eaſie; That the promiſe made to *Adam*, was of Chriſt that ſhould be a Saviour Four thouſand years after; not that ſhould be a Saviour to himſelf, and Wife, and their immediate Seed. They were to be ſaved by *a belief* (not in Chriſt, but) *of the Principles of the Natural Religion, founded upon Natural Demonſtration, or moral Arguments, as that God is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him, which was the faith of* Abel *and* Enoch, *whereby they pleaſed God* (as you told me before).

*Sherlock*, You have repreſented my Opinion in my own words; and I like that very well.

*Satan*, I thought I would pleaſe you if I could, and put you in a good humour againſt I make ſome more objections. And but that you ſtart ſo many Hares at once, that I am a-

fraid by running after all, to loſe all; I could pleaſe you better, by putting you in mind, that as to theſe Words of God to *Eve*, a very good Friend of yours, *Valentinus Smalcius*, whom a Learned *Calviniſt* calls, *inſignis illefidei Socinianæ hyperaſpiſtes*, the Champion of ſocinianiſm, does boldly affirm, *Chriſtum minime reſpexiſſe, nec aliquidin ſe promiſſionis Evangelicæ continuiſſe*; They had no reſpect to Chriſt, nor did they contain in them any Goſpel promiſe *Refut. Theſ. Franizii*, p. 94. But I will go on; The *Calviniſts* will object againſt your Logick in the Text now cited, *Rom.* 3.29. and tell you, that not the Relation which God as a Creator ſtands in to Jews and Gentiles, but as a Covenanter with *Abraham* on the behalf of both, is given as the Reaſon why both ſhould be juſtified by Faith, and not one only.

*Sherlock.* This Objection——

*Satan.* Hold Sir, never give your ſelf the trouble of anſwering it: It was a diſparagement to *Domitian*, to employ himſelf in catching and killing Flies. And in my mind you did diſcreetly in not anſwering *E. P. H. H.* and that Pert Man that called you *Dirty-Fellow* in the Title of his Book; for ſo *Anti-ſozzo* ſignifies (whether you know it or no). And it had not been amiſs, if you had let *J. O.* and R. *F.* alone too; for none of them all were your match: The moſt that can be ſaid of them is, *never was any Brazen Serpent half ſo ſubtil*, p. 113.

*Sher-*

*Sherlock.* I am not of your opinion, That I had better have let all my Antagoniſts alone; for then they would have ſaid, that I did not anſwer them, becauſe I could not.

*Satan.* You have little to do ſure, to mind what they ſay. To end this Chat, pray eaſe me of this Objection againſt Gods loving all his Creatures alike, That I find God hates me, and therefore will never love me, for his hatred is (like himſelf) immutable.

*Sherlock.* To the Fanaticks fancy, that when God once loves them he will never hate them, becauſe his love is (like himſelf) immutable, I have anſwer'd: *Herein the immutability and unchangeableneſs of Gods love conſiſts, not that he always loves the ſame perſon, but that he always loves for the ſame reaſon; for it is no perfection to be ſo fixt in our kindneſs, that where we love once, we will always love, whatever reaſon there may be to alter our affection: for by this means we may love undeſerving objects, which is the greateſt degeneracy of love; but the perfection of love conſiſts in loving deſerving objects, and in loving upon honourable reaſons; and the immutability of love conſiſts in loving always for the ſame reaſon, which is the only foundation of vertuous immutability*, pag. 404, 405. Thou art not ſo dull, but thou canſt apply all this to thy ſatisfaction.

*Satan.* I apprehend your meaning well enough, that there is *par ratio* (as your School-

term is) of Gods love and hatred. And therefore therein the immutability of Gods hatred consists, not that he always hates the same person, but that he always hates for the same reason. For it is no perfection to be so fixt in our unkindness, that where we hate once we will always hate, whatever reason there may be to alter our affections; for by this means we may hate undeserving Objects, which is the greatest degeneracy of hatred, *&c.* In short, your meaning is, that God hates me for this reason, because I am bad, but he would love me if I were good, and I should then as well *deserve his love*, as I do now his hatred.

*Sherlock.* I see you have not your name Δαίμων, knowing, for nought, you have wit enough if you will but make a good use of it.

*Satan.* I am beholding to you Sir, for your good word. And I promise you I will not be wanting to my own interest. The notion you have last given me does me a great kindness. For I have been hitherto so simple (though you are pleased to commend my wit) as to think that Love and Hatred when ascribed to God, in the *Calvinists* notion, which you decry, did import an eternal Decree or Will of God, to shew or deny mercy to his Creatures, and so were *immutable*: but now I understand that they signifie variable affections (as in the Creatures) which as the Weather

ther-cock, ſhifts its corner with the wnd, alter with the perſons upon whom they are placed. And I am now rid of a fear, which the mention of *Elect-Angels* in the Scripture did often put me into. I ſee nothing to the contrary but I may in good time be one of that *denomination*. If I can but bring down my ſtout ſtomach, to ask God forgiveneſs, and repent of ſo long continued diſloyalty, and take a new Oath of Allegiance, I underſtand I need not doubt the iſſue, God will love me, as much as now he hates me.

*Sherlock*. 'Tis a great mater to be freed from prejudice or prepoſſeſſion of judgment. You have often heard *Calviniſts* preach, and been dabling in their writings: and have found them confident enough in their aſſertions, and (as I gather from your words) been miſlead into a conceit, (which they put into your head) that becauſe it could not be known how juſt and ſevere God is, but by puniſhing ſin, nor how good and gracious God is, but by pardoning it, therefore God decrees that men ſhall ſin, that he may make ſome of them veſſels of his wrath, and others the veſſels of his mercy.

*Satan*. I muſt confeſs, *The ſound and clink of words and phraſes (which you ſay is all the Calviniſts underſtand by keeping a form of ſound words*, p. 102.) did ſo fill my ears, that I could hear nothing elſe. And becauſe they

were Scripture-words and phraſes, they kept me in ſome awe, that I durſt not abſolutely conclude them a ſound without ſenſe.

*Sherlock.* I, but *nature would teach us, that ſo good a God had much rather be glorious in the happineſs and perfection, and obedience of his creatures, than in their ſin and miſery*, p. 51, 52. *For vindictive juſtice, and pardoning mercy are but ſecondary Attributes of the Divine Nature, and therefore God cannot primarily deſign the glorifying of them; for that cannot be without primarily deſigning the ſin and miſery of his creatures, which would be inconſiſtent with the goodneſs and holineſs of his nature*, p. 52, 53.

*Satan.* I know your meaning very well, that there is in God an *Antecedent will*, whereby he willeth ſome things in the *firſt* place, and *directly*; and a *Conſequent will*, whereby he willeth other things in the *ſecond* place, or by *conſequence*: thus whatſoever is good in it ſelf, as the repentance and ſalvation of a ſinner, God wills by his *Antecedent will*; but whatſoever in it ſelf is not evil, but evil to the reaſonable Creature which muſt ſuffer it, as death, damnation, God willeth only by his *Conſequent Will*. The Objections of the *Calviniſts* ſhall not give me any trouble, That God wills that which never comes to paſs, and which he knows will not, when he wills it by that *Antecedent Will*. This is enough for my comfort, that my repentance and ſalvation

on being things good in themſelves, God wills them in the firſt place, and directly; my damnation he wills but in the ſecond place, and by conſequence. God is ſo good, that he had much rather be glorious in my happineſs, (who am one of his Creatures, though I have loſt it through my own default), than in my miſery. And though Saint *Paul* ſeems to be of another mind, yet I will remember, that *Theſe men fetch all their myſterious Divinity out of ſome obſcure paſſages of* St. Pauls *Epiſtles, notwithſtanding what St.* Peter *told us of St.* Pauls *Epiſtles,* 2 Pet. 3. 16, *and make them the foundation of their faith,* p. 242. Sir, I have given you a great trouble; I have but two or three Objections more. If God loves all his Creatures alike, becauſe he is their common Creator, then there is no need of a Saviour, the want of which was alway my greateſt diſcouragement; I have often heard that the Son of God took not upon him the nature of Angels, but the ſeed of *Abraham*, and that neglect of our nature, made my caſe deſperate in my own apprehenſion.

*Sherlock.* To this I anſwer two things:

1. *That the only knowledg neceſſary to the purpoſes of Religion is ſuch a knowledg of Gods nature and will, as is ſufficient to direct our actions, and encourage our obedience,* p. 33. *Various ways God attempted for the recovery of mankind,*

*but with little ſucceſs; at laſt God ſent his own Son our Lord Jeſus Chriſt into the world to be the great Shepherd and Biſhop of ſouls, to ſeek and to ſave that which was loſt*, p. 89. *God hath now committed unto Chriſt all the ſecret purpoſes of his Counſel concerning the ſalvation of mankind, which were concealed from ages*, p. 30.

*Satan.* I perceive you ſpeak cautiouſly to prevent ſcandal; but I undrſtand you not, unleſs you mean that the knoledg of a Saviour was concealed from the world till Chriſt came in the fleſh, ( which was not till the World was about four thouſand years old ) and the reaſon of that concealment was, becauſe the knowledg of God in Chriſt, was not abſolutely neceſſary to the purpoſes of Religion ( whereof eternal Salvation is not the leaſt conſiderable.) And if the knowledg of a Saviour, be not abſolutely neceſſary, then not a Saviour himſelf; for he gives ſalvation, by giving the knowledg of Salvation; and it is Eternal life to know Jeſus Chriſt ( if Chriſt himſelf or his Prophets deſerve any credit.) And now we are under the Roſe, I will tell you truly, that I believe all your talk of a Saviour is but a Copy of your Countenance. For if the World was ſaved for ſo long time without a Saviour, why may it not for the remainder of its duration, be it more or leſs? And this I confeſs is no ſmall Cordial to my dying hopes. But let me ask you one Queſti-

on,

on, If a Saviour be of no greater moment in the purpoſes of Religion, why does the Scripture call the contrivement of mans Salvation by a Saviour, *the wiſdom of God?* I had thought the reaſon had been, becauſe there was no other means of Salvation but this, which he alone did and could find out.

*Sherlock.* You are groſly miſtaken. *For if juſtice be ſo natural to God, that nothing can ſatisfie him but the death of his Son, the Redemption of the World by Chriſt may diſcover his juſtice or goodneſs, but not his wiſdom; for wiſdom conſiſts in the choice of the beſt and fitteſt means to attain an end, when there are more ways than one of doing it;* p. 48. I grant indeed *that no doubt but the Goſpel of Chriſt makes great and glorious diſcoveries of the wiſdom of God,* Ib. and I have told you wherein before, *In that he ſent his own ſon,* &c. *when he had attempted various ways before with little ſucceſs* for the recovery of mankind, p. 89.

*Satan.* I pray proceed to your ſecond head.

*Sherlock.* That ſuppoſing a Saviour of abſolute neceſſity to your ſalvation, you need not abſolutely deſpair of one: *When we conſider that this Heavenly Embaſſador and Mediator, is no leſs than the eternal Son of God, by whom the Worlds were made, we may reaſonably conclude, that he came upon no leſs deſign than of univerſal goodneſs: for he can have no temptation to partiality, as being equally concerned in the*

*happineſs of all men; and we cannot imagin why he ſhould lay a narrower deſign of love in the Redemption, than in the Creation of Mankind; that when in the firſt he deſigned all men for happineſs, in this new and ſecond Creation he ſhould deſign and intend the happineſs only of ſome few*, p. 82, 83.

*Satan.* I ſee the force of your Argumentation, That the eternal Son of God being my Creator, as well as mans, I may reaſonably conclude he came upon no leſs deſign than of univerſal goodneſs to me as well as men. For ſeeing he deſigned me for happineſs, as well as mankind in the firſt Creation, why ſhould he deſign their happineſs only, and not mine in the new and ſecond Creation? For he as our common Creator can have no temptation to partiality, as being equally concerned in the happineſs of all his reaſonable Creatures, Angels and Men. The ſmaller Exceptions againſt this Argumentation muſt give way to a greater. That you told me before, that none *could believe in Chriſt till he came*, p. 247. Now I underſtand not why they could not, if he was the eternal Son of God, by whom the World was made. For then he was pre-exiſtent; and being God, they that lived before he came in the fleſh, wanted not the *Ratio Formalis* of Divine Faith, the Authority of God revealing. But I preſume you mean, that Chriſt was from eternity decreed to be the Son

of

of God in time, *non Deus natus, ſed factitius* not God by nature but deputation, as you know who ſays, and who added in a ſcoff, *mirum quod non ſubſtituiſſet, fictitius.* I wonder he did not ſay an imaginary God, *Prid. Lact.* 18.) And that the World made by him was *non quem videmus, ſed quem expectamus,* not the world which we ſee, but a ſettlement of the Goſpel-Diſpenſation. And now I think on it, it comes much to one for my comfort, ſeeing he was ſent by our common Creator, who can have no temptation to partiality, in ſending Chriſt for men only, and not for Angels, as being equally concerned in all our happineſs. To diſmiſs this; There is one obvious Objection againſt my inference, of your own ſuggeſtion, *The Son of God was made a man as we are, which argues a good will and kindneſs to humane nature,* p. 81, 82. But I think, I can anſwer it my ſelf, that the Son of Gods admitting an innumerable company of my fellow-Angels to attend upon him as Mediator, argues a good will and kindneſs to Angelical nature. There is another too, which I will not now put you to anſwer (having given you ſo great a trouble already) but will conſider of it by my ſelf. The Objection is this, that 'tis no partiality for the Son of God, though he hath taken the nature common to mankind, to ſave as few as he pleaſe, for partiality or reſpect of perſons hath no place in grantiug largeſſes, or

be-

beſtowing donatives. And if ſo, 'tis no partiality to ſave mankind, and leave me to the ruin I have brought upon my ſelf. It is the *Calviniſts* anſwer to your great Argument for univerſal Redemption, and it leaves ſome ſcruple upon my mind. Upon the whole of your diſcourſe, I perceive I ſlipt my time (for want of due information) of regaining the love of God without a Saviour, for that I might have done any time before he came in the fleſh; *for no man (nor Angel) could believe in Chriſt till he came:* But that time is gone and paſt, and cannot be recall'd. I muſt now for my comfort conſider what he hath done, and ſuffer'd, and how the benefit of both may redound to me. Firſt then I conſider, that his active righteouſneſs muſt be imputed to me ſo far as it is a conformity to that law of Nature which is common to me and mankind.

*Sherlock.* This *makes Chriſt ſuitable to the wants of a ſinner indeed, that he has a righteouſneſs for him which God infinitely prefers before any home-ſpun righteouſneſs of his own. This is a very comfortable notion for bad men, and ſuch as I would not part with for all the world, did I reſolve to live wickedly, and yet intend to get to heaven,* p. 234.

*Satan.* What Sir, do you jeer?

*Sherlock.* I tell you, that *Abraham and all the good men of old, never heard of the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us,* p. 256. *Sa-*

*Satan*, No, I ſee St. *Paul* is a man of no credit with you. He ſays that *Abraham* had a *righteouſneſs without works imputed to him.* That could not be his own righteouſneſs, for that were *contradictio in adjecto*, to ſay he had a righteouſneſs of his own, without works of his own (as your Schools ſay) (righteouſneſs reſulting from the conformity of works to a Law.) It muſt therefore be the righteouſneſs of another, and who that other ſhould be, but *Chriſt*, I cannot tell; but I would be glad to learn.

Sherlock, *The great diſpute in the Epiſtle to the Romans is, whether we muſt be juſtified by the Law of Moſes, or by the faith of Chriſt*, i. e. *whether the obſervation of all the external rites and ceremonies of the Law, and an external conformity of our actions to the moral precepts of it, will juſtifie a man before God, or that ſincere and univerſal obedience which the Law requires*, p. 245.

*Satan*. One would think that it had been unqueſtionable, that *Abrahaus* could not have had whereof to glory, if he had been juſtified by an external conformity to the Ceremonial and Moral precepts of the Law. But I perceive one may live and learn. But though there is no need of a Saviour, as to any active righteouſneſs of his to be imputed to ſinners; yet I preſume there is need of one to die as a *ſurety* in their ſtead and place.

*Sherlock*, When *Chriſt died for us, he died*

*not*

*not as a ſurety*, p. 290. *The Socinians have no reaſon to be afraid of ſuch Adverſaries, who have no better way to defend the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, than by the notion of ſuretiſhip*, p. 291.

*Satan*, 'Tis well *J. O.* that pa•lous man is not within hearing. What? will you acknowledg the *Socinians* ſtand on the vantage ground, when *Chriſtians* defend the ſatisfaction of Chriſt by the notion of ſuretiſhip? I am apt to think they cannot defend it by any other notion, the ſum whereof is (as I warrant you *J. O. T. J.* and all the letters of the Alphabet will tell you) that *Chriſt put himſelf into the ſtead of ſinners to ſuffer what they ſhould have ſuffer'd; upon which God makes over Chriſts ſatisfaction to them.* And they will take for their warrant that place, where Chriſt is call'd Ἔγγυος διαθήκης, *The ſuerty of the Covenant.*

*Sherlock*, I confeſs I do not like to be call'd a *Socinian*, becauſe that name does *male audire*, ſome ill in the Church of *England*. And I reckon my ſelf therefore much beholden to my two Brethren, whereof one tacitly by an *Imprimatur*, and the other by expreſs words, vindicated me from the imputation of Hereſie, and particularly of being tainted with *Cracovian* Divinity. But let *J. O. T. J.* aud who will beſides pleaſe themſelves with their own notion of ſuertiſhip; I ſay, *To be a ſurety of the Covenant ſignifies no more than to confirm and ratifie this Covenant, and to undertake for the*

*per-*

*performance of it, that all the promiſes of the Covenant ſhall be made good upon ſuch terms and conditions as are annexed to them*, p. 289.

*Satan*, Then it ſeems Chriſt is but Gods ſurety to man; that he will be as gsood as his word: but I ſhould think that notion of ſuretiſhip were out of doors, by the grounds you laid down a while ſince. For if the *light of nature aſſures ſinners, that God is ſo good that he hath a natural love for all good men, and will not fail to reward them, though he never made them a promiſe*, p. 42, 43. Methinks it may aſſure them too, that God is ſo faithful that he will not break his promiſe when he hath made it. And it may ſeem, that as to the confirmation of the Covenant of God with man (whatever your ſentiments are of Chriſts God-head) Chriſt needed not to have been God, for whatever aſſurance can be gathered from the *undertakers* being God, is afforded us in the *promiſers* being ſo. And in fine, Chriſt is no ſurety at all; and ſo we need not diſpute about our intereſt in him: for as far as I can perceive by your principles, that ſinners might have been ſaved, if he had never died for them; and they may be damned, though he hath. And now I am prevented in my enquiry how the benefit of what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered, might redound to me. I had thought to have asked what *Faith* is requiſite to the participation of the benefits of Chriſt.

Christs righteousness; and what *Union* results from that Faith whereby his righteousness, and its effects become a sinners.

*Sherlock*, You mistake the matter, you may enquire, and I will satisfy you about the nature of Faith, and the Union thence resulting. For as hasty as you are in your censure of my making Christ useless (which I should take very hainously, but that I think you do but personate the *Fan's*): I will tell you, *The death of Christ upon the cross, assures us what the merit is, and what the portion of sin shall be; that all sinners deserve to die, and shall certainly have their desexts, without a sincere repentance and reformation of their lives: for to expiate sin by death can signifie no less than this, that death is the proper recompence of sin.* p. 92.

*Satan*, A goodly end of Christs death, would *J. O.* say, were he within hearing, which hath been and may be otherwise obtained. The light of nature, [or natural notions of Gods justice] and works of Providence [Gods judgments upon the wicked] would assure men of the merit of sin, and what the portion of sin should be, without sincere repentance and reformation [and with it too] as well as assure them (which you have often told me) of Gods readiness to pardon upon repentance and reformation.

Again, *J. O.* would say, that the death of Christ would not assure us, that death is the recompence

compence of ſin; unleſs Chriſts death was the puniſhment of ſin, which if it was, it muſt be of mans ſin (for he had none of his own) and then Chriſt died as a *ſurety* in the ſinners ſtead (a notion which *J. O.* embraces, and *W. S.* rejects), and ſo you have brought your hogs to a fair market indeed.

*Sherlock*, In *verbo ſacerdotis*, on the word of a Prieſt, I think you are turned Fanatick.

*Satan*, You have granted one uſe of Chriſts death [which will ſerve my turn] as for the other, I preſume it was *Lapſus linguæ*, a ſlip of your tongue; but the hopes you give me with one hand, you take away with the other, when you tell me, *The Sacrifice of his death extends no farther than the example of his life; he was made manifeſt to deſtroy ſin, and in him was no ſin*, p. 93. It ſeems then that Chriſt died only for thoſe in whom was no ſin at all. And then I am too ſure Chriſt died not for me: but one comfort then is, that neither died he for any body elſe.

*Sherlock*, I explain my meaning well enough, when I ſay, that *Conſidering how holy our Prieſt and Sacrifice was, we cannot reaſonably conceive that he died, or that he interceded for incorrigible ſinners*, p. 93,

*Satan*, All that I can gather from thence for explication, is, that we cannot reaſonably conceive that he died for any ſinners, unleſs he were a ſinner himſelf, (though not incorrigible)

rigible) for otherwiſe the Sacrifice of his death would extend farther then the example of his life. He that was no ſinner, would die for them that were ſinners. To leave this to further conſideration, pray tell me what uſe you aſſign to Chriſts active obedience?

Sherlock, *Though the pardon of our ſins, and our juſtification, be attributed to the blood of Chriſt, yet I could never perſwade my ſelf, that this wholly excludes the perfect obedience and righteouſneſs of his life*, p. 330.

*Satan*, Very good; now *J. O.* and you are very good friends, for he could never perſwade himſelf ſo neither.

*Sherlock*, 'Tis not good manners to interrupt me; *J. O.* and I are far enough from being good friends: *For the Apoſtle tell us, That we are accepted in the Beloved*, Eph. 1. 6.

*Satan*, That very place *J. O.* brings for his own juſtification, in being always of your perſwaſion in this point.

*Sherlock*, You are very unmannerly methinks.

*Satan*, Excuſe me Sir, I am afraid you ſhould forget your ſelf, and ſay as *J. O.* ſays, unawares.

*Sherlock*, Never fear that, but hear me out. *And I think no man will deny that God was very highly pleaſed with the perfect obedience of our Saviours life*, p. 330, 331.

Sa-

*Satan.* No, I dare say, not *Socinus* himself. Enough, enough, I see what you would be at. Christ by his obedience *satisfecit voluntati divinæ non justitiæ*, i. e. satisfied Gods will, not his justice. I am past doubt now that *J.O.* and *W.S.* are not like to be very good friends in haste.

Sherlock. *Verbum sat sapienti*, A word is enough to the wise. Now to answer your Queries, which too hastily you concluded you were prevented in. I will tell you what Faith is not requisite to the participation of the benefits of Christs Righteousnes. *There is not a plainer Argument how apt men are to pervert the Scriptures, to reconcile them to their own prejudices and preconceived Opinions, than to observe what work they make with* Abrahams *Faith; as if that Faith which was imputed to him for righteousnes, were a fiducial reliance and recumbency on Christ for salvation, upon which the righteousnes of Christ apprehended by Faith was imputed to him*, p. 247.

*Satan.* If *Abrahams* Faith was not a fiducial reliance and recumbency on Christ for Salvation, then to be sure, non any of his Childrens. For they walk in his steps, and imitate his Example. But pray, what Faith is requisite to make Christ our Saviour, seeing a Saviour you will have him to be? I care not if I hear you out.

Sherlock. *Our Faith in Christ must signifie such a stedfast belief of all those revelations*

*which Christ both made to the World, as governs our lives and actions*, p. 255.

*Satan.* Then I perceive I am one half of a Believer already; for I stedfastly believe all those Revelations which Christ hath made to the World: and I am not without hopes of being the other half in good time, of having my life and actions governed by my Belief.

*Sherlock.* You have no cause of despair: for besides (what I have told you already, that *God produces not what he loves, by an Omnipotent Power, but does good to his Creatures in such a way as is suitable to their natures*), *Righteousness is called a gift, because it is not owing solely to humane endeavours, but is wrought in us by supernatural means, by those powerful arguments and motives, and divine assistances which God in infinite love and goodness has afforded the world by Jesus Christ*, p. 335.

*Satan.* I understand you right well, That Righteousness [or the good government of life and actions] is called Gods gift, because he gives one *half*, (but hardly the *better half* would a *Fanatick* say), *the arguments and motives* which are very *powerful* [*in genere morali*] to induce the world to make it self-righteous; and them you call *divine assistances*, because God assists the World by them, that is, by those Arguments and Motives perswades men to use the power they have; for to give them any power they wanted, were for God

*to produce what he loves by an Omnipotent Power* [*in genere Phyſico.*]

*Sherlock.* There's no need of any Omnipotent Power in the *Fanatick* ſenſe; For *that righteouſneſs which God requires under the Goſpel, muſt be an inward principle of love and obedience, which changes our natures, and transforms us into the Image of God, as much as if we were born again, and made new creatures*, p. 265.

*Satan.* You mean, Sir, that a ſtedfaſt Belief of Gods revelations, does excite that love and obedience, which changes our natures, *&c.* and ſo makes a new Birth needleſs; but Mr. *Sherlock*, ſome cavelling *Fanatick* would be ſo perverſe (I dare ſay) were you diſcourſing with him, as to tell you, that our natures are changed before they can put forth a Belief ſtedfaſt enough to excite love and obedience: And as *they will be fooling with Scripture-metaphors* (*though you have corrected them for it*, p. 281.) they would tell you, that the Childs motion does not give it life, but its life gives it motion.

*Sherlock.* And as for that *union* that you mentioned *between Chriſt and Believers*, the Fanaticks commonly explain it by firſt a *Legal union, ſuch as is between the ſurety and debtor*, p. 281. *ſome inſiſt moſt upon the notion of a Surety, others of a Mediator, which come much to one, but yet have ſome peculiar abſurdities belonging to each of them*, p. 287. As firſt for the notion of a Surety——

*Satan.* You need not tire your self with the repetition of them: I can easily gues at them, the imparity between Christs being a Surety, and sureties among men. As to that you know the Rule, *Similitudo non currit quatuor pedibus*, Similitudes do not hold in every thing. It will be thought enough, that they agree in the main, that as the Debtor and Surety are so far one person in the eye of humane law, that the payment of the Surety is the Debtors discharge; so Christ and a Believer are so far one person in the eye of the Divine Law, that Christs undergoing the punishment of the Law, discharges the Believer from it; and Christs active obedience to the Law, disobliges the Believer from obeying it to that end (for which it was originally intended, and) for which Christ obeyed it, *viz.* that it might be the *material and meritorious cause of our justification.*

Sherlock. *Let us now try whether the notion of a Mediator can do any better service, than the notion of a Surety*, p. 296. *The notion of a Mediator includes no such thing as the fulfilling of all righteousness for them, whom one is Mediator to*, p. 296, 297.

*Satan.* Sir, Your Antagonists answer will be the same in effect, that though a *Mediator is one who interposes between two differing parties, and his Office is not to perform the conditions himself* (as you well observe) p. 297, yet the difference between God and man could

not

not be accommodated (you will be told) by this Mediator, but by performing the conditions himself. For the reason why *God would not enter into a Covenant with sinners without the intervention of a sacrifice*, p. 297, was, because his Law being broken, till the penalty due to that breach was undergone, and his honour thereby vindicated, he could not right his Mercy, without wronging his Justice.

*Sherlock.* I have done with the *Legal Union*. There is *secondly*, a *Mystical Union*, by vertue of which *they imagine that we receive Grace from Christs person, just as we do water out of a Conduit*, p. 197, 204. Whereas *a Mediator as Mediator, ought not to be considered as the Fountain, but as the Minister of Grace*, p. 209.

*Satan.* I have always understood, that they mean no more by their *Mystical Union*, than an union Analogical to *natural* union, such as that of Vine and Branches, Head and Members, by vertue of which they suppose they are passive in receiving grace from Christ, as the Branches in receiving sap from the Root, and the Members spirits from the Head. But this I perceive is an imagination without ground in your opinion. And your reason against it confirms me more in my suspicion, that you do but *verba dare*, deceive, when you say, *The Union of the Divine and Humane Nature in Christ did excellently qualifie him for the office of a Mediator*, p. 205, 206. For if Christ as a Mediator

be not the fountain of Grace, *ſecundum naturam divinam*, i. e. as God he may paſs from a Mediator, though he were ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, a meer man; then he might *perſwade men* to be gracious by *powerful motives* (though he could not beſtow grace upon them) which is all you intend by Chriſts being a *miniſter of Grace*. The *Fanaticks* indeed, ſilly ſouls as they are, think, that Chriſts Obedience was the meritorious cauſe of Grace, and his Spirit the efficient or fountain of it: but you inſtruct them better, that Chriſt by his blood purchaſed only a Covenant of Salvation, to them that have grace (come by it as they can.) But pray, Sir, what *Union* do you allow of, any, or none?

*Sherlock.* The Union between Chriſt and the Chriſtian Church, is but a Political Union, that is, ſuch an Union as is between a King and his Subjects, *p.* 156.

*Satan.* Then am I united already, (which is more than ever I knew before: for Chriſt is Head of Principalities and Powers, and they are his ſubjects, *de jure*, I am ſure.)

*Sherlock.* Hold there, *our union to Chriſt conſiſts in our belief of his Revelations*, Ib.

*Satan.* Then ſtill my claim is good; for I *believe all his Revelations*; (and were I ſure none but friends were within hearing, I would ſay, *that's more than you do.*)

*Sherlock.* You are a jeering Companion and a little too haſty; our union to Chriſt con-

conſiſts alſo in our obedience to his Laws, and ſubjection to his Authority, *p.* 156.

*Satan.* Now I am half gone. But yet I live in hopes, that the *powerful motives* you have talked ſo much of, may be powerful enough to move me to that obedience and ſubjection I owe to Chriſts Laws and Authority, ſeeing I already believe all his Revelations. I will not give you much longer trouble, I have but one ſcruple more. I perceive by your laſt diſcourſe, That *God requir'd not ſuch a ſacrifice as the death of Chriſt for the expiation of our ſins, becauſe he could not do otherwiſe*, p. 46. This I would have made plain. For it ſticks much with me, that I am a debtor to Divine Juſtice, and therefore I do not underſtand how God can be good to me, till that debt be paid, and Juſtice ſatisfied. For if he ſhould, it ſeems to me that God ſhould raiſe one of his Attributes upon the ruin of another, and ſo do himſelf a prejudice, to do me a kindneſs. Your charity I believe is ſuch that you wiſh me well, as you do all mankind. Anſwer but this one Objection, and I am ſatisfied.

Sherlock. *That God is ſo juſt and righteous, that he cannot pardon ſin without ſatisfaction to his juſtice, is indeed ſuch a notion of juſtice, as is perfectly new, which neither Scripture nor nature acquaints us with; for all mankind have accounted it an act of goodneſs (without the leaſt*

*ſuſpition of injuſtice in it) to remit injuries and offences without exacting any puniſhment; and that he is ſo far from being juſt, that he is cruel and ſavage, who will remit no offence till he hath ſatisfied his revenge. That part of juſtice which conſiſts in puniſhing of offenders, was always looked on as an inſtrument of Government, and therefore the exacting or remitting puniſhment, was referred to the wiſdom of Governeurs, who might ſpare or puniſh as they ſaw reaſon for it, without being unjuſt in either*, p. 45, 46. And this is ſo rational, that thou canſt not but ſubſcribe to the judgment of all mankind. And but that I think you propoſe this ſcruple only to try what anſwer I can make; I ſhould wonder one of ſo pregnant wit ſhould talk ſo like a fool.

*Satan.* I doubt Sir, you have not conſulted all mankind, I have heard other doctrine conſtantly taught in the Aſſemblies of Chriſtians (who ſure are part of mankind) where I have been a conſtant and attentive hearer, and I cannot but believe and tremble.

*Sherlock.* I doubt, Sir Satan, your ears have not been matches. It may be you have heard ſuch doctrine in Conventicles: There is one *John Owen* that hath given us a taſte of the gift he exerciſes in ſuch Aſſembles, in a late Book, Entituled, *Communion with God the Father, &c.* that tells us, what ever diſcoveries were made of the patience and lenity of

God

God to us, yet if it were not withal revealed that the other Properties of God, as his Justice and Revenge for Sin, had their actings assigned them to the full, there could be little consolation gathered from the former, p. 95. But what say I to this? *That is*, J. O. *would not believe God himself though he should make never so many promises of being good and gracious to sinners, unless he were sure, that he had first satisfied his reveng. The sume of which is, That God is all love and patience when he has taken his fill of revenge, as others use to say, That the Devil is good when he is pleased* p. 47. Excuse me that I make use of your name.

*Satan.* I willingly excuse your making use of my name; for seeing I have failed in my ambition of being *like God*, I am well enough content, you should make God like me.

*Sherlock.* Elsewhere the same *J. O.* says, That in Christ the very nature of God is discovered to be love and kindness. But I think I pay him off. Hearken and you shall have my Comment with his Text to a tittle. *An happy change, this from all Justice to all Love! but how comes this to pass? why the account of that is very plain; because the Justice of God hath glutted it self with revenge on sin, in the death of Christ and so henceforward we may be sure he will be very kind, as a revengeful man is when his passion is over*, p. 46.

*Satan.* But what's the matter then that sinners (which I know by woful experience my

self)

ſelf) are haunted with continual fears of Gods Juſtice. Thoſe fears ſeem to be the effects of the natural notions of God's Juſtice, which we carry about with us.

*Sherlock.* The *workings of the Law, the amazing terrors of Gods wrath, the raging deſpair of damned ſpirits, are the working of an heated fancy, and Religious diſtraction,* p. 95. *Theſe muſt needs be the effect of ignorance, not of an acquaintance with Chriſt, which ſuggeſts ſo many encouraging-conſiderations to return to God, as to a merciful and compaſſionate Father, and not to tremble at his preſence as a ſevere and inexorable Judg.* Ib.

*Satan. O bene factum!* O well done my white Boy: *O Lepidum caput!* now your work is done, you have obliged me for ever. For now I underſtand, that my fears are but melancholy and hypochondraical (ſuch as timerous perſons are ſubject to when left in the dark). There is nothing in Gods nature can give me cauſe of fear, (at leaſt, if I do but return to God) but there is enough in it to give me cauſe of hope. And though I have no acquaintance with Chriſt, my acquaintance with God will ſerve my turn. For Chriſt diſcovers nothing more of Gods gracious nature to ſinners, than we knew before by the light of nature. (as I well remember you inſtructed me awhile ſince.) In ſhort, it ſeems *there is a naturalneſs of mercy in God, but not of juſtice.* *Sherlock,*

*Sherlock*, No, no; of the naturalneſs of Gods Juſtice, that he could not pardon ſin without ſatisfaction, I make this the import, *That he is ſo juſt, that he hath not one dram of goodneſs in him, till his rage and vengeance be ſatisfied, which is a glorious kind of Juſtice I confeſs*, p. 59.

*Satan*, I perceive you are a merry Gentleman; and ſo are all of your Club. And I hope hereafter I ſhall be merry too, and be fit to make one of you. *I am ſure I had almoſt pored out my eyes with ſeeking for theſe Goſpel myſteries in the Goſpel, and could never find them*, p. 40. (To borrow your ſignificant words, with your good leave) but now I underſtand that I looked for them where they were not. I ſhould have learned *to argue from the nature of God, and his works of Providence, and the nature of mankind* [and Angels] though *the Fanaticks call ſuch arguings carnal reaſon*, p. 79. There is nothing now remains (beſides thanks for your pains), but to ſum up the heads of Argument upon which my hopes of ſalvation (as well as mans are built.) And if I ſhould miſrepreſent any of them, you will pleaſe to correct my miſtakes.

1. *That God is ſo good, that he deſigns and deſires the happineſs of all his Creatures, according to the capacity of their natures* [and therefore mine.]

2 *That*

2. *That Gods will in that design is not arbitrary, having no reason but it self: For such a will would destroy all the perfections of Gods nature.*

3. *That holiness in the Creature, is the reason of the determination of his love to any particular person.*

4. *That this holiness is not an effect of an Omnipotent Power, but of powerful motives and arguments,* [and so by the use of my free-will, I may be holy if I will.]

5. *That though this holiness be not perfect, yet God will accept it, if sincere.*

6. *This acceptance of my sincere holiness, I have reason to believe and hope for, though I have no promise.* For

7. *Gods gracious nature obliges him to reward all sincerely, (though imperfectly) good actions. God is merciful to all, whose Creator he is, and affords them all possible means of Salvation, without a Saviour, or any knowledg of one.* And accordingly,

8. *De facto,* Abel *and* Enoch, *and* Abraham, *were saved without a Faith in Christ. And needs they must, because no man could believe in Christ till he came.* And

9. *Though God hates me now, yet he may love me hereafter. For Gods love and hatred are not immutable, nor does the immutability of them consist in loving or hating alway the same person, but for the same reason,* because they are either

either good or bad. And (which may confirm me)

10. *God never designed the glory of mercy and justice in saving some, and not others, in the permission of his Creatures sins.*

11. Though a Saviour was brought into the world after it was about Four thousand years old; yet he was not of absolute necessity, *for the only knowledg absolutely necessary to the purposes of Religion* (whereof Salvation is not the least) *is such a knowledg of Gods nature and will, as is sufficient to direct our actions, and incourage our obedience* And hence,

12. *The wisdom of God was not discovered in sending a Saviour, if there were no other way of redeeming the World. For wisdom consists in the choice of the best and fittest means to attain an end, when there are more ways than one of doing it.*

13. *This Saviour being the Eternal Son of God, we may reasonably conclude he came upon no less design than of universal goodness; for he can have no temptation to partiality, as being equally concerned in the happiness of all men; and we cannot imagine why he should lay a narrower design of love in the redemption, than in the Creation of mankind,* &c. [all which fits my case; the Eternal Son of God being my Creator, hath no temptation to partiality, being equally concerned in my happi-

happineſs and mans, as we are his rational Creatures.]

14. That a *Saviour* is of no great uſe now he is come. For he *comes neither to fulfil the Law for ſinners, nor to die in their ſtead, but only to confirm Gods promiſe of ſaving them that repent and forſake their ſins*; which *promiſe* was needleſs, Gods nature obliging him to ſave ſinners upon thoſe terms, before any promiſe; and the light of nature diſcovering that obligation; nor was the *confirming* of it needful: For the light of nature would teach us that God will not break his promiſe. [And ſo if it ſhould happen that the Saviour was not intended for me, yet I might be ſaved, as *Abel* and *Enoch* were, without *one*.] And I gather from hence, that you make the blood of Chriſt no more ſatisfactory than the blood of Bulls and Goats were under the Law; but that God was pleaſed with both upon the ſame reaſon; becauſe *the ſhedding of his* and their *blood, was an act of obedience to his will, not a ſatisfaction to his Juſtice.* And ſo you have ſubverted the Goſpel, (which ſtood in the way of my hopes of Salvation) for which I con you hearty thanks. And hence I collect,

15. That whoever was or ſhall be juſtified, were and ſhall be juſtified without any righte-

righteouſneſs at all. For *righteouſneſs* importing a relation reſulting from the conformity of diſpoſitions and actions to their Rule, *ſincerity is no righteouſneſs at all* (ſuppoſing the righteouſneſs of Chriſt not ſo far imputed as to take away its defects) unleſs the Law as a Rule requires no more conformity to it ſelf, than the Goſpel as a Covenant accepts; which cannot be, becauſe then no deviations from the Law are ſinful, where there is ſincerity.

16. A Saviour is the leſs needful, becauſe *Gods Juſtice is not natural, though his mercy is. And the fears of ſinful men* [and ſo of Angels] *of Gods Juſtice, are but the workings of heated fancy, and religious diſtraction.*

17. If a Saviour be of uſe, the way to come by an intereſt in him, *is not a fiducial reliance or recumbence on Chriſt. For that* Abraham *had not*, [and ſo nor his children] *but a believing his Revelations*, [which the Church of *England* ſomewhere in her Homilies acknowledges I do. and the chief of them, *The Articles of Faith*] *and governing our lives by them* [which I hope to do hereafter.] So that *Abrahams* Faith and a Believers now, are of a different kind; but *your faith and mine are of one kind*, we both believe Gods Revelations upon Chriſts Authority, though I hope your belief governs your life and actions better than mine hath done hitherto.

18. The

18. The *Union* made by Faith, is not *mystical*, i. e. analogical to a natural Union between Vine and Branches, *&c.* nor therefore are we passive in the reception of Grace, to believe and live accordingly. For *a Mediator as such is no fountain of Grace, but only a Minister of Grace*, i. e. one that by powerful motives perswades us to be gracious (come by grace as we may) [and so it is not impossible but I may get grace, though I be not united to Christ] but *the Union made by Faith is Political, consisting in a belief of Christs Revelations* [which I have already] *and government of our actions* [which I am in hopes of in time, for *Christ is the Minister of this Grace, by proposing powerful arguments to it*] Is not all this right?

*Sherlock*, Very right. I admire your tenacious memory and ingenuity in so artificial a connexion of a rambling discourse, and in your easie and natural inferences from my grounds.

*Satan*. I wonder at your freedom in owning all my Consequences, (though I think verily they are deduced evidently enough from your grounds, because you have subscribed the Articles of the Church of *England*, and the Church of *England* somewhere says, *They are to be had accursed that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which*

*which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and* THE LIGHT OF NATURE. *For holy Scripture doth set out to us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved,* [Art. 18.] Which directly contradicts one of the main grounds you laid down for my hopes. And again she says, *The Old Testament is not contrary to the New. For both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man,* [Art. 7.] And this thwarts another of your principal Positions. And out of the Articles and Homilies I could produce passages that are diametrically opposite to every Position of yours, which I have repeated, and you approved.

*Sherlock.* Do not trouble your head about reconciling my Positions with the Church of *England's*, as long as I have an *Imprimatur*.

*Satan.* Excuse me Sir, I was afraid your kindness to me should prove an unkindness to your self, and bring you under Church-censure. If your grounds be true (as I see no cause to doubt) I am sure I have cause to *bless* you, though the Church of *England* curses you [in her 18*th*. Article] and to wish that that curse being causeless, may never come upon you, in a suspension *ab officio & beneficio*. Long may you enjoy St. *George Buttolph* Lane, and St. *Buttolph Billingsgate*; in the latter of

which you may be sufficiently instructed in the *eighth Liberal Art*, which the vulgar call *Scolding*, but the learned *Raillery*. I know you can bear a jest.

And now Sir, I heartily thank you for your great pains, and truly Catholick charity, which exceeds any Prophets, Apostles, and even the Church of *England's* it self.

*Sherlock*. I wish the profit may be greater to you, than the pains have been to me. Farewell.

---

## Postscript to the READER.

THE *Author of these Sheets conceives he cannot excogitate a fitter close than* Mr. Sherlock's *to his second Section, with no other alteration than the substitution of two words*, God nature, *instead of* Christ's person *and of* God *instead of* Christ.

Thus Reader, I have given thee an entire scheme of a new Religion, resulting from an acquaintance

tance with [Gods nature] in all its fundamental Principles and Practices; here is every jot and tittle of reaſon it is founded on, or pretends to, and the moſt obvious and eaſie connexion of one part with another, whereby thou maiſt eaſily judg of the whole fabrick and contrivance; and I think there needs no more to expoſe it to the ſcorn of every conſidering man, who cannot but diſcover how inconſiſtent the Religion of [Gods nature] and of his Goſpel are: this is that knowledg of [God] theſe men [Mr. *S. and his Club*] glory in, as containing greater myſteries, & more ſoul-ſaving truths, than are revealed in the Goſpel, p. 75. *And the Author thinks fit to add, that he preſumes that no conſidering man*

*will doubt whether this* new *Religion deſerves that character which the learned* Dr. Arrowſmith *gives of it; and the men that are of that Religion, deſerve that ſharp cenſure which the learned* Grotius *gives of them, in the paſſages quoted in the Title-page, (which for the ſake of the unlearned Reader it may not be amiſs to tranſlate.* In Socinianiſm, which not undeſervedly is called a more refin'd Mahometaniſm, Hell and Irreligion open their mouths wide. So *Arrowſmith.* The Socinians I think unworthy not only of the name of Chriſtians, but even of Hereticks. They retain the name of Chriſtianity, but they deſtroy the thing that bears that name. Therefore I judg they differ very little from Mahometans, who themſelves do not

not speak evil of Jesus. So *Grotius*. *The only thing that may seem wanting to brand the* Sherlockians *with the name of* Socinians, *and so of* more refined Mahometans, *is an explicite denial of the* Godhead of Christ; *which whether they be not in a good forwardness for, let the Reader judg by that passage,* No man could believe in Christ till he came, that is, could not believe any thing upon his Authority, *p.* 247. *It is a Question which for his own credits sake,* Mr. Sherlock *were bound (one would think) to answer, why no man could believe any thing upon Christs Authority, till he came? The only reason his Antagonists can imagine is, because* Christ had no Authority before he came. *And if that be it, the falshood of that ground is evident*

*enough*

*enough (as otherwiſe ſo) by the light of* Pſal. 110. 1. *and* Mat. 23. 43,44,45, *compared, where* David *call'd* [*and ſo accounted*] *Chriſt* his Lord, *before he came; and conſequently ſuppoſes him to have Authority to exact belief. And from that falſe ground, that Chriſt had no Authority before he came,* [*ſuppoſing it yet to be true*] *this inference is fair, that he was* not pre-exiſtent, *and ſo* nor God before he came. *And thence another, that he had no ſuch Authority when he come, as* Mr. Sherlock *denies him before he came, that is no primary and immediate Divine Authority, but only ſecondary and mediate, that is, the Authority of a Prophet, the belief of whom is reſolved into the Authority of him that ſent him as its proper ground. And how finely*

*does this notion ſuit with the account which the Socinians give of the reaſon of the denomination of* the Son of God, *and* God, *given by Chriſt to himſelf.* His verbis (viz. *Joh.* 10.35,36.) apertiſſime indicat Chriſtus, quod nullam aliam ob cauſam majorem, ſeipſum Dei Filium, ac proinde Deum aſſeruerit, niſi quod a Patre ſanctificatus, & in mundum miſſus fuerit, *Cat. Racov. cap. de Cog. Dei.* That is, In theſe words, *viz.* Joh. 10.35,36. Chriſt does plainly declare, that for no other greater reaſon does he affirm that he is the Son of God, & therefore God, then becauſe he was ſanctified of the Father, and ſent into the world. *And leaſt* Mr. Sherlock *(or any on his behalf) ſhould complain of wrong done him, and not know of whom to demand*

ſa-

*satisfaction, the Author hath thought meet to alter his first resolution of concealing his Name, and with the discovery of it to give this account of himself, that he is one who hath subscribed the 36 Articles of the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *and does hereby profess the continuance of his approbation of them as Orthodox, and consonant to the Scripture; and withal that he is not so void of candor, but that if* Mr. *S. convince him that he hath wrested any of his words; or made any illogical deductions from his Principles, he will not fail to give publick satisfaction in what form* Mr. S. *himself shall prescribe, which (he conceives) is as much as any reasonable man can require, or any honest man need to promise.*

THO. DANSON.
Sometime Fell. of *Magd.* Coll. *Oxon.*